recommend to the Associate General Counsel (Intellectual Property) whether to grant the license.

DATES: Comments to the notice must be received by July 31, 1995.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code GP, Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Harry Lupuloff, NASA, Director of Patent Licensing at (202) 358–2041.

Dated: May 19, 1995.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95–13043 Filed 5–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Collection of Information Submitted for OMB Review

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act and OMB Guidelines, the National Science Foundation is posting an expedited notice of information collection that will affect the public. Interested persons are invited to submit comments by June 30, 1995. Copies of materials may be obtained at the NSF address or telephone number shown below.

(A) *Agency Clearance Officer.* Herman G. Fleming, Division of Contracts, Policy and Oversight, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, or by telephone (703) 306–1243. Comments may also be submitted to:

(B) *OMB Desk Officer.* Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, ATTN: Jonathan Winer, Desk Officer, OMB, 722 Jackson Place, Room 3208, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503.

Title: Education and Human Resources Impact Database.

Affected Public: State or local governments.

Respondents/Reporting Burden: 19 respondents: average 110 hours per response.

Abstract: An Integrated data system that will contain data for all programs managed by the NSF's Directorate for Education and Human Resources. Data will be used to support program studies and evaluations and also for effective program assessments and evaluations throughout the Directorate.

Dated: May 24, 1995.

Herman G. Fleming,

Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–13129 Filed 5–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Notice of Permit Applications Received Under the Antarctic Conservation Act

AGENCY: Notice is hereby given that the National Science Foundation (NSF) has received a waste management permit application from Mr. Skip Novak, owner and operator of the *Pelagic* (a 54-foot steel sloop), for management of materials and wastes for camping and climbing activities in the Antarctic Peninsula, submitted to NSF pursuant to regulations issued under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978.

DATES: Interested parties are invited to submit written data, comments, or views with respect to this permit application on or before June 29, 1995. Permit applications may be inspected by interested parties at the Permit Office, address below.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Permit Office, Room 755, Office of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert S. Cunningham or Peter R. Karasik at the above address or (703) 306–1031.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NSF's Antarctic Waste Regulation, 45 CFR Part 671, requires all U.S. citizens and entities to obtain a permit for the use or release of banned substances or designated pollutants in Antarctica, and for the release of waste in Antarctica. NSF has received a permit application under this Regulation which covers materials and waste management associated with two planned expeditions per year by the *Pelagic,* which accommodates a total of eight people on board, for camping and climbing activities along the Antarctic peninsula. The permit applicant is: Mr. Skip Novak, PELAGIC, 92 Stachell Lane, Hamble, Hampshire, S031 4HL ENGLAND. The proposed duration of the permit is from December 27, 1995 through December 26, 2000.

Activity for Which Permit Requested

The PELAGIC is planned to make two 35-day trips per year to the Antarctic Peninsula. Passengers will be making one to two day outings on shore at various landing locations and will be using gasoline or kerosene in camping stoves during camping and climbing trips. All garbage including food wastes, plastics, tins, and bottles will be packed out of Antarctica and returned to South America on the ship. Conditions of the permit will include requirements to avoid Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (SPAs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), educate participants with the requirements of the Antarctic Conservation Act (ACA), report on the removal of materials and any accidental releases, and manage human waste in accordance with antarctic waste regulations.

Robert S. Cunningham,

NEPA Compliance Manager, Office of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 95–13056 Filed 5–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–424 and 50–425]

Georgia Power Company, et al; Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–68 and NPF–84, issued to Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee) for operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (Vogtle), Units 1 and 2, located at the licensee's site in Burke County, Georgia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.60, ''Acceptance Criteria for Fracture Prevention Measures for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors for Normal Operation,'' to allow application of an alternate methodology to determine the low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) setpoint for Vogtle. The proposed alternate methodology is consistent with guidelines developed by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria (WGOPC) to define pressure limits during LTOP events that avoid certain unnecessary operational restrictions, provide adequate margins against failure of the reactor pressure vessel, and reduce the potential for unnecessary activation of pressure-relieving devices used for LTOP. These guidelines have been incorporated into Code Case N–514, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection,'' that has been approved by the ASME Code Committee. The content of this Code case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI. The NRC staff is revising 10 CFR 50.55a that will

endorse the 1993 Addenda and Appendix G of Section XI into the regulations.

The philosophy used to develop Code Case N–514 guidelines is to ensure that the LTOP limits are still below the pressure/temperature (P/T) limits for normal operation, but allow the pressure that may occur with activation of pressure-relieving devices to exceed the P/T limits, provided acceptable margins are maintained during these events. This philosophy protects the pressure vessel from LTOP events, and still maintains the Technical Specification P/T limits applicable for normal heatup and cooldown in accordance with Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 and Sections III and XI of the ASME Code.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for an exemption to 10 CFR 50.60 dated October 3, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated March 1, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Section 50.60 states that all light-water nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness and material surveillance program requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR part 50. Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50 defines P/T limits during any condition of normal operation, including anticipated operational occurrences and system hydrostatic tests, to which the pressure boundary may be subjected over its service lifetime. Section 50.60(b) specifies that alternatives to the described requirements in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR part 50 may be used when an exemption is granted by the Commission under 10 CFR 50.12.

To prevent transients that would produce pressure excursions exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits while the reactor is operating at low temperatures, the licensee installed an LTOP system. The LTOP system includes pressure relieving devices in the form of Power-Operated Relief Valves (PORVs) that are set at a pressure low enough that if a transient occurred while the coolant temperature is below the LTOP enabling temperature, they would prevent the pressure in the reactor vessel from exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits. To prevent these PORVs from lifting as a result of normal operating pressure surges (e.g., reactor coolant pump starting, and shifting operating charging pumps) with the reactor coolant system in a water solid condition, the operating pressure must be maintained below the PORV setpoint.

In addition, in order to prevent cavitation of a reactor coolant pump, the operator must maintain a differential pressure across the reactor coolant pump seals. Therefore, the licensee must operate the plant in a pressure window that is defined as the difference between the minimum required pressure to start a reactor coolant pump and the operating margin to prevent lifting of the PORVs due to normal operating pressure surges. The licensee's proposed LTOP analysis includes changes to account for the non-conservatism identified in Westinghouse Nuclear Safety Advisory Letter 93005A and Information Notice 93–58. The new analysis accounts for the static head due to elevation differences and the dynamic head effect of four reactor coolant pumps (RCP) operation. By including these factors and using the Appendix G safety margins, the licensee determined that the operating margin to the PORV setpoint would be depleted at approximately 120°F for Unit 1 and 145°F for Unit 2. Therefore, operating with these limits could result in the lifting of the PORVs and cavitation of the RCPs during normal operation.

The licensee proposed that in determining the PORV setpoint for LTOP events for Vogtle Units 1 and 2, the allowable pressure be determined using the safety margins developed in an alternate methodology, in lieu of the safety margins required by Appendix G to 10 CFR Part 50. Designated Code Case N–514, the proposed alternate methodology is consistent with guidelines developed by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria to define pressure limits during LTOP events that avoid certain unnecessary operational restrictions, provide adequate margins against failure of the reactor pressure vessel, and reduce the potential for unnecessary activation of pressure-relieving devices used for LTOP. Code Case N–514, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection,'' has been approved by the ASME Code Committee. The content of his Code case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI. The NRC staff is revising 10 CFR 50.55a, which will endorse the 1993 Addenda and Appendix G of Section XI into the regulations.

An exemption from 10 CFR 50.60 is required to use the alternate methodology for calculating the maximum allowable pressure for the LTOP setpoint. By letter dated October 3, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated March 1, 1995, the licensee requested an exemption from 10 CFR 50.60 for this purpose.

In addition to requesting the exemption from 10 CFR 50.60, the licensee proposed an amendment to the Technical Specifications revising the LTOP analysis. The new analysis removes the non-conservatism as described previously. The amendment will be evaluated separate from this exemption request.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Appendix G of the ASME Code requires that the P/T limits be calculated: (a) Using a safety factor of 2 on the principal membrane (pressure) stresses, (b) assuming a flaw at the surface with a depth of one-quarter (¼) of the vessel wall thickness and a length of six (6) times its depth, and (c) using a conservative fracture toughness curve that is based on the lower bound of static, dynamic, and crack arrest fracture toughness tests on material similar to the McGuire reactor vessel material.

In determining the PORV setpoint for LTOP events, the licensee proposed to use safety margins based on an alternative methodology consistent with the proposed ASME Code Case N–514 guidelines. The ASME Code Case N–514 allows determination of the setpoint for LTOP events such that the maximum pressure in the vessel would not exceed 110% of the P/T limits of the existing ASME Appendix G requirements. This results in a safety factor of 1.8 on the principal membrame stresses. All other factors, including assumed flaw size and fracture toughness, remain the same. Although this methodology would reduce the safety factor on the principal membrane stresses, use of the proposed criteria will provide adequate margins of safety to the reactor vessel during LTOP transients and will satisfy the underlying purpose of 10 CFR 50.60 for fracture toughness requirements.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the type of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed change involves use of more realistic safety margins for determining the PORV setpoint during LTOP events. It does not affect non-radiological plant

effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 23, 1995, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. James L. Setser of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The state official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated October 3, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated March 1, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room located at the Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia 30830.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–13103 Filed 5–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Reveiw of NRC Inspection Report Content, Format, and Style

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is revising its procedures on inspection reports and requests public comment on whether the content, format and style of inspection reports as currently issued are appropriate, and how they may be improved.The NRC is soliciting comments from interested public interest groups, the regulated industry, States, and concerned citizens. Comments are requested from both reactor and materials licensees. This request is intended to assist the NRC in making the inspection report a more effective tool for communicating with the regulated industry and the public, and in meeting the NRC's responsibility for public health and safety.

DATES: The comment period expires June 29, 1995. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: David Meyers, Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publication Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: T–6D–59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand deliver comments to: 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laban Coblentz, Mail Stop: O–12E–4, Inspection Program Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415–2619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) has begun a review of the content, format, and style of NRC inspection reports, as a preliminary step to revising internal inspection report procedures. The review is being led by Laban Coblentz, Inspection Program Branch, NRR, and is being supplemented by contacts in other NRC Headquarters offices and the regions.

This review will attempt, through discussion, review, and consensus-building, to define the characteristics of the ideal NRC inspection report, and to revise internal procedures to produce reports meeting those characteristics. As such, it involves understanding the results of other assessments, learning from inspection report users, and evaluating the interfaces of the report with other agency processes and systems. The scope of the review applies only to documenting inspection results, and does not encompass the focus, scope, or frequency of inspections.

NRC inspection reports are primarily designed to communicate the results of an NRC inspection to the licensee inspected. They:

(1) Briefly describe the areas inspected, with more detail given to support more significant findings;

(2) Give general conclusions about the effectiveness of the Program or activity inspected;

(3) Provide a basis for other NRC action, including Enforcement actions, Plant Performance Reviews, Systematic Assessments of Licensee Performance (SALPs), and other assessments.

In addition to the primary addressee, inspection reports communicate relevant information on licensee performance to other NRC offices, other licensees, public interest groups, Congressional oversight committees, other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and the public. Unless exempted from pubic disclosure (e.g., because of containing proprietary or safeguards information), copies of NRC inspection reports are placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR).

Scope of the Review

This review will attempt to approach the NRC inspection report from two perspectives. The first is that of the initial readers—primarily the licensee to whom the report is addressed, but also the other readers listed above. This viewpoint should highlight questions such as, ''Is the message clear?'' ''Is the information presented in a logical, consistent manner?'' ''Is the tone appropriate?'' etc.

The second viewpoint is that of subsequent users (e.g., a manager preparing a SALP report, an inspector scanning old reports for past problems, a group of local citizens reviewing a licensee's history of issues, or an external agency evaluating the effectiveness of NRC inspection in a particular area). This viewpoint should emphasize the ease of information retrieval, consistency of format from report to report, effective report